arXiv:1610.09700v1 [math-ph] 30 Oct 2016

Absence of Binding in the Nelson Model

Gonzalo A. Bley

Institut for Matematik, Aarhus Universitet,
Ny Munkegade 118, 8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

November 1, 2016

Abstract

We prove that two non-relativistic nucleons interacting with a massless meson field (a massless Nelson model with two particles) do not bind when a sufficiently strong Coulomb repulsion between the nucleons is added to the Hamiltonian, an explicit estimate of which is provided. The result holds for both the renormalized and unrenormalized theories. The problem solved here is important from a physical point of view, since there is a model for an electron interacting with the acoustical vibrational modes of a crystal through the piezoelectric interaction, the so-called piezoelectric polaron, which has exactly the same Hamiltonian as the Nelson model considered here for one particle, and so the result can be interpreted as a no-binding statement about piezoelectric bipolarons. For this last model a simpler condition for absence of binding is found than for the Nelson model, as we take advantage of the fact that we are allowed to keep the ultraviolet cutoff finite at all times. The methods used allow also for a modest improvement over previously known no-binding conditions for the optical bipolaron model.

1 Introduction

The intent of this article is to provide a simple proof that two particles attracting each other via an effective massless Nelson-model interaction do not bind when they repel one another through a strong enough Coulomb repulsion. Even though in the Nelson model the particles involved are nucleons, the problem solved here is physically relevant, since there is a model of two electrons interacting with the acoustical vibrational modes of a piezoelectric crystal, the so-called piezoelectric bipolaron, that has exactly the same Hamiltonian as the massless Nelson model for two particles, with the addition of a Coulomb repulsion term. In the following subsection we will describe the models involved while providing references for them; however, in the present article we will concentrate mostly on the piezoelectric polaron.

1.1 The Models Involved

1.1.1 The Massless Nelson Model

The massless Nelson model describes the interaction of a system of N non-relativistic nucleons with a quantized, massless meson field. Its Hamiltonian reads as

$$H = -\sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{\Delta_n}{2} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi_\Lambda(k)|k| a_k^\dagger a_k \, dk + \sqrt{\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\chi_\Lambda(k)}{\sqrt{|k|}} \left(e^{ikx_n} a_k + e^{-ikx_n} a_k^\dagger \right) dk, \tag{1.1}$$

acting on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{3N}) \otimes \mathcal{F}$, where $\mathcal{F}$ is the Fock space on $L^2\left(\mathbb{R}^3\right)$. a_k and $a_k^\dagger$ denote the annihiliation and creation operators for the k-th mode of the field, respectively, and satisfy the relations $[a_k, a_{k'}^\dagger] = \delta\left(k - k'\right)$ and $[a_k, a_{k'}] = [a_k^\dagger, a_{k'}^\dagger] = 0$. α is a non-negative number, the coupling constant of the interaction between the nucleons and the meson field; Λ is also a non-negative number, and it acts as an ultraviolet cutoff; and χ_Λ is the indicator function of the ball of radius Λ centered at the origin. Δ_n is simply the part of the full

$3N$-Laplacian corresponding to the particle n, namely if $X = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N)$ is the position vector of the particles (a $3N$-dimensional vector), and if $x_n = (x_n^1, x_n^2, x_n^3)$, then $\Delta_n = \partial^2/\partial^2 x_n^1 + \partial^2/\partial^2 x_n^2 + \partial^2/\partial^2 x_n^3$. The model is due to Edward Nelson, who presented it for the first time in 1964 in [22], and subsequently in [21]. The most noteworthy property of the Hamiltonian (1.1) is that it requires renormalization if one is to make sense of H when $\Lambda = \infty$: even though H is self-adjoint and bounded-below when Λ is finite, the ground-state energy of H goes to negative infinity as $\Lambda \to \infty$, at least as fast as $-C \log \Lambda$, where C is a positive constant. However, if one adds a term, that we denote by Q and define as

$$\alpha N \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\chi_\Lambda(k)}{|k|^2 \left(|k|/2 + 1\right)} \, dk = 8\pi\alpha N \log\left(1 + \Lambda/2\right), \tag{1.2}$$

then one obtains a self-adjoint, bounded below operator $\widehat{H}$ in the limit; more precisely, for every real t, $e^{it(H_\Lambda + Q_\Lambda)}$ goes to $e^{it\widehat{H}}$ strongly as Λ goes to infinity. This was observed by Nelson [21]. We are interested here in the case $N = 2$.

1.1.2 The Piezoelectric Polaron

Regarding one of the other models in question here, the piezoelectric polaron, it describes the interaction of an electron with the acoustical vibrational modes of a piezoelectric crystal. It is usually attributed to R.A. Hutson [14], and to G.D. Mahan and J.J. Hopfield [20]. Its Hamiltonian is the same as that of the massless Nelson model,

$$H^1 \equiv -\frac{\Delta}{2} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi_\Lambda(k)|k| a_k^\dagger a_k \, dk + \sqrt{\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\chi_\Lambda(k)}{\sqrt{|k|}} \left(e^{ikx} a_k + e^{-ikx} a_k^\dagger\right) \, dk, \tag{1.3}$$

where now Λ is kept fixed at a positive value, the so-called Debye wave number [15, Page 430, Footnote 6]. α is defined in terms of quantities that depend on the crystal in question (such as the speed of sound); see [24, 26] for a precise definiton of this constant, and also [23, 27] to gain a better understanding of the model. We we will study here the case of two electrons in a piezoelectric crystal, whose Hamiltonian follows directly from (1.3),

$$H_A^2 \equiv -\sum_{n=1}^{2} \frac{\Delta_n}{2} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi_\Lambda(k)|k| a_k^\dagger a_k \, dk + \sqrt{\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\chi_\Lambda(k)}{\sqrt{|k|}} \left(e^{ikx_n} a_k + e^{-ikx_n} a_k^\dagger\right) \, dk + \frac{A}{|x_1 - x_2|}. \tag{1.4}$$

Physically A is, after fully restoring units, $e^2/(4\pi\varepsilon)$, where e is the electron charge and ε is the permittivity of the medium the electrons are in (indeed, not the vacuum, but a crystal), but it will be more transparent to simply treat A as a fixed constant that can take any non-negative value. Here one may treat the two electrons as fermions or simply not impose any simmetry on them – our final result will be valid in both cases.

1.1.3 The Optical Polaron

The last model we will have the opportunity to discuss is that of the optical polaron of H. Fröhlich [10, 9]. It describes the interaction of a single non-relativistic electron with the optical vibrational modes of a crystal lattice. Its Hamiltonian is similar to the ones just described, acting on the same space as before, and where the notation symbolizes the same as well, the main difference being that there is no ultraviolet cutoff,

$$-\frac{\Delta}{2} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} a_k^\dagger a_k \, dk + \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{2^{3/4}\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(a_k e^{ikx} + a_k^\dagger e^{-ikx}\right) \, dk. \tag{1.5}$$

Even though the model was first devised by Fröhlich, many people after him provided critical contributions to its understanding. One of them was R. Feynman, who in 1955 [7] provided a new interpretation of the interaction of the electron with the lattice through the use of functional integrals. In particular, the functional integral analysis reveals a fact that is not visible at the level of the operator (1.5), which is that the electron, roughly speaking, is attracted to its own past history via a Coulomb interaction of strength α. Relevant here as well is to mention works by T.D. Lee, F.E. Low, D. Pines [16, 17], and M. Gurari [12],

where a variational principle due to S. Tomonaga [25] allowed the obtention of a power series expansion of the ground-state energy of the polaron in terms of the total momentum of the system. (They really obtain an upper bound, since they use a trial state in their analysis.) We would like also to mention perturbation-theoretic calculations for the polaron due to E. Haga [13], and a work by E.H. Lieb and K. Yamazaki, where a rigorous lower bound to the polaron energy was found [19]. These are all early works from the 50's. Important for us in the present article is a more recent work from R.L. Frank, E.H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, and L.E. Thomas [8] where, in particular, a no-binding condition for the optical bipolaron was found. We will refer to that article repeatedly during the rest of the paper. The work of Frank et al. provides also good references on more recent works on the model.

1.2 Results and Methods of Proof

A simple argument involving functional integrals, which we will elaborate on later, shows that the interaction of the two electrons with each other when $A = 0$, mediated through their coupling with the acoustic phonon field, is attractive and "retarded Coulomb-like" with strength α – up to constants. If A is big enough (or, equivalently, if α is small enough), one would expect that in the minimum energy configuration the electrons would be pushed very far apart by the Coulomb repulsion (which would overcome, by virtue of its strength, the attraction created by the interaction of the particles with the field), having them interacting by themselves with their own local cloud of excitations of the phonon field. In particular, one would expect that the ground-state energy of the entire system of two electrons immersed in the crystal would be just twice the ground-state energy of the Hamiltonian above for one piezoelectric polaron, Equation (1.3). Exactly how much bigger A would have to be in relation to α would depend on the intricate and exact nature of the attraction between the two electrons. And since this is by no means a simple attraction, we are merely able to prove that if $A \geq C(\Lambda)\alpha$, where $C(\Lambda)$ is an explicit but diverging function of Λ, then the ground-state energy of the full Hamiltonian (1.4) is twice the ground-state energy of the corresponding single-particle Hamiltonian (1.3). We certainly do not endeavor into making any statements as to the sharpness of this relation, since we simply do not know what happens if A is smaller than this quantity. Even though our function $C(\Lambda)$ goes to ∞ as $\Lambda \to \infty$, this is not a problem for the piezoelectric polaron, since one keeps Λ finite, but it is an issue for the Nelson model, as in that case one does take Λ to ∞ in order to renormalize it. We relegate a no-binding result for the Nelson model to the last section of this article, and the reason why we leave it for last is that we do not get what one would like, or expect – we obtain a non-linear relationship between A and α. This is most likely an artifact; see Section 4.

The method of proof of the results above involves three ingredients: First, a partition of unity of the configuration space $\mathbb{R}^6$ of the position of the two electrons, adapted to the piezoelectric bipolaron from what Frank, Lieb, Seiringer, and Thomas did in 2011 in [8] for the optical bipolaron. The partition allows local estimates to be made. Second, refined upper and lower bounds for the ground-state energy of two particles interacting with each other and with a quantum field through the Nelson interaction (without repelling each other), given in a recent paper of the author [2]; and third, the observation that the massless Nelson interaction is essentially Coulomb when the interparticle distance is localized, which becomes apparent at the functional integral level – see Section 3. Regarding the first ingredient, a double partition of unity was performed in [8], where the interparticle distance was first split using a single length scale that is then raised to ever higher powers for large distances, in order to control the localization error; a second partition for the entire space $\mathbb{R}^6$ is then made using two movable balls of fixed radius, in order to localize the electrons even further in their own "boxes." In total, they localize, so to speak, 7 degrees of freedom (the interparticle distance, which is a one-dimensional object, plus the center of each ball, gives a total of 7), which is obviously an "overlocalization" (there being only 6 spatial degrees of freedom), and one would expect to be able to solve the problem without localizing so much. Indeed, we show how one can make do with just localizing one of the balls, and not the two of them. Thus, in total, we localize just 4 degrees of freedom. All the partitions are then completely optimized using a reduction of the resulting infinite dimensional minimization problem to a very low dimensional one, as in [1]. Despite the smaller number of localizations performed, our methods do not lead to a significant improvement of the no-binding condition in the optical bipolaron case. As a matter of fact, the improvement is merely passing from $A \geq 52.1\alpha$ [1] to $A \geq 49.0\alpha$. (In [8] the condition was $A \geq 53.2\alpha$.) See Section 4. We remark in passing that the current article is partly based on Chapter 5 of the Ph.D. thesis of the author [3], which contains a mistake that is relevant to point out here: a claim

based on a flawed argument was made there, that there is no binding for optical bipolarons when $A \geq 25.2\alpha$. Even though the claim might well be true, it was derived there using a partition of $\mathbb{R}^6$ that is perhaps just too simplistic, and a subtlety arising from the retarded interaction between the electrons was overlooked. In fact, if the interaction were exactly Coulomb, there would be no problem, and the argument from the thesis would be correct. It is the "delayed" nature of the action of the two electrons that invalidates the line of reasoning, suggesting one should localize even further. We explain in detail in Appendix B.

We would like to finish this subsection by pointing out a result known as the subadditivity of the energy. For our purposes here it merely states that $\inf \operatorname{spec} H_A^2 \leq 2 \inf \operatorname{spec} H^1$, where H^1 and H_A^2 have been defined in the previous subsection. This result holds even if one treats the electrons as fermions (meaning that the infimum on the left is on anti-symmetric functions). The proof is a careful execution of what we waved our hands with in the first paragraph of this subsection; the idea is to separate the two electrons as much as possible, so that they interact with their own phonon cloud. See [18, Section 14.2] and the references in [11, Theorem 1.4 and its proof] for more information. What is missing to prove absence of binding is then the other inequality $\inf \operatorname{spec} H_A^2 \geq 2 \inf \operatorname{spec} H^1$, and that is what this article provides. One then gets that the binding energy, $2 \inf \operatorname{spec} H^1 - \inf \operatorname{spec} H_A^2$, is zero. The same arguments hold for the optical polaron model.

1.3 Remark on Some Functional Integrals

Our proofs below will rely heavily on the use of functional integrals for the computation of ground-state energies. In particular, for the two-electron piezoelectric polaron (or two-nucleon massless Nelson model with repulsion) we have the following formula for the ground-state energy,

$$-\lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} E^{(x,y)} \left[\exp\left(\alpha \sum_{m,n=1}^{2} \iint_0^T \int_0^t \chi_\Lambda(k) e^{-|k|(t-s)} e^{-ik(X_t^m - X_s^n)} |k|^{-1} \, ds \, dt \, dk - A \int_0^T \frac{dt}{|X_t^1 - X_t^2|} \right) \right], \tag{1.6}$$

where $X = (X^1, X^2)$ is $6 = 3+3$-dimensional Brownian motion starting at (x, y), which can be set equal to any point in 6-space. As for the optical bipolaron model, the corresponding formula is

$$-\lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} E^{(x,y)} \left[\exp\left(\frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{m,n=1}^{2} \int_0^T \int_0^t \frac{e^{-(t-s)}}{|X_t^m - X_s^n|} \, ds \, dt - A \int_0^T \frac{dt}{|X_t^1 - X_t^2|} \right) \right]. \tag{1.7}$$

These two formulas are particular cases of the ground-state energy of a general model of non-relativistic particles interacting with a quantum field and with one another. A more general formula – which we do not give here, since we shall not use it – is derived from scratch by means of the Trotter product formula in the Ph.D. thesis of the author [3, Chapter 2]. Noteworthy is the fact that the quantum field variables have disappeared in the two Feynman-Kac formulas above. Formula (1.6) was known to Nelson in his first work on his model [22] – a functional integral analysis of the model was in fact his first approach to the Hamiltonian (1.1), that he left behind in favor of operator methods [21]. Formula (1.7) was found for the first time by Feynman [7] in the case of a single electron, by integrating the quantum field variables, using methods developed in [6]. These two formulas, and variations of them, will be used throughout the rest of article.

1.4 The Structure of the Article and Acknowledgments

We now give an outline of the article. In Section 2 we partition the distance between electrons. This is the first localization. In Section 3 another localization is performed, where a single electron is placed in a ball, thus "pinning" it to a center. This second localization allows the two electrons to stay far apart, even in terms of the Coulomb-like interaction between the electrons, arising from the coupling with the field (which is not a totally trivial fact, as will become clear later in the paper). The final result $A \geq C(\Lambda)\alpha$ is given in this section. Then, in Section 4 we study what happens when the method used for the piezoelectric polaron is mimicked in the optical bipolaron and Nelson models. In particular, we obtain a small improvement over previous results on no-binding of optical bipolarons, bringing the condition $A \geq 52.1\alpha$ to $A \geq 49.0\alpha$,

as mentioned in the previous paragraph. In Appendix A we provide a short proof of an upper and lower bound for the massless Nelson model that are used in the no-binding proof for the piezoelectric polaron. In Appendix B we explain and address a mistake made in the Ph.D. thesis of the author.

We would like to take this last paragraph to thank Lawrence Thomas for very long and productive discussions. The author acknowledges as well partial support from the Danish Council for Independent Research (Grant number DFF-4181-00221).

2 Partition of Interparticle Distance.

In this section we perform a partition of unity on the configuration space $\mathbb{R}^6$ for the position (x, y) of two three-dimensional particles. The construction here follows the lines in [8, Section 2], adapted to our purposes for the piezoelectric polaron. We first partition the half real-line $[0, \infty)$ with the bump functions

$$\varphi_0(t) \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & 0 \leq t \leq a_0 \\ \cos\left[\dfrac{\pi(t-a_0)}{2a_1}\right] & a_0 \leq t \leq a_0 + a_1, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\varphi_n(t) \equiv \begin{cases} \sin\left[\dfrac{\pi\,(t-s_{n-1})}{2a_n}\right] & s_{n-1} \leq t \leq s_n \\ \cos\left[\dfrac{\pi\,(t-s_n)}{2a_{n+1}}\right] & s_n \leq t \leq s_{n+1}, \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

when $n \geq 1$, where $s_n \equiv \sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i$. (Each φ_n is defined as 0 outside of the intervals given above.) Here $a_0, a_1, a_2, \ldots$ are arbitrary positive constants that will be optimized later. Each one of the functions φ_n represents an asymmetric bump in the shape of a sine function with one side longer than the other, with the exception of φ_0, which is the shape of a half-pill. By construction $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \varphi_n^2(t)$ is equal to 1 for all t, and so the functions φ_n form a quadratic partition of unity for $[0, \infty)$. We then use these functions to separate the interparticle distance, resulting in a partition of $\mathbb{R}^6$; namely, we consider the functions $\phi_n(x, y) \equiv \varphi_n(|x-y|)$ for $n \geq 0$. And since obviously $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi_n^2 = 1$, the collection of functions $\phi_0, \phi_1, \phi_2, \ldots$ forms a quadratic partition of unity for $\mathbb{R}^6$. We then have, by the IMS formula [5, Section 3.1],

$$H_A^2 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi_n H_A^2 \phi_n - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\nabla \phi_n|^2, \tag{2.3}$$

where we recall that H_A^2 is the Hamiltonian of the piezoelectric bipolaron, Equation (1.4). The second term in (2.3) is called the localization error. It tells us that localizing comes at an increase in kinetic energy (which is expected, given the uncertainty principle).

For ψ as any state in the quadratic form domain of H_A^2 one has, by defining $\psi_n \equiv \phi_n \psi$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\psi, H_A^2 \psi) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\psi_n, H_A^2 \psi_n) - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \big(\psi, |\nabla \phi_n|^2 \psi\big) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \big(\psi_n, H_0^2 \psi_n\big) - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \big(\psi, |\nabla \phi_n|^2 \psi\big) + A \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \big(\psi_n, |x-y|^{-1} \psi_n\big) \\ &\geq (\psi_0, H_0^2 \psi_0) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\psi_n, H_0^2 \psi_n) - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\psi, |\nabla \phi_n|^2 \psi) + A \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\|\psi_n\|^2}{s_{n+1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

The idea now is to provide individual bounds to each one of the terms in (2.4) so that, if A is big enough,

$$(\psi, H_A^2 \psi) \geq 2 \text{ inf spec } H^1 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|\psi_n\|^2 = 2 \text{ inf spec } H^1 \|\psi\|^2, \tag{2.5}$$

which will imply no-binding. (Recall that H^1 is the analog of Equation (1.4) for just one particle, Equation (1.3).) We will start with the third term in (2.4). This can be controlled as follows: by noticing that $|\nabla\phi_n(x,y)|^2 = 2|\varphi_n'(|x-y|)|^2$ for all n and recalling that $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\phi_m^2 = 1$,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(\psi,|\nabla\phi_n|^2\psi) = 2\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(\psi,|\varphi_n'(|x-y|)|^2\psi) = 2\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(\psi_m,|\varphi_n'(|x-y|)|^2\psi_m\right)$$
$$\leq \frac{\pi^2}{a_1^2}\|\psi_0\|^2 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{\pi^2}{\min(a_{m+1},a_m)^2}\|\psi_m\|^2. \tag{2.6}$$

We now continue with the first term in (2.4). This corresponds to the case where the electrons are close to each other. We provide in Appendix A the following lower and upper bounds for the piezoelectric polaron: The ground-state energy of the two-particle piezoelectric polaron without repulsion is bounded below by $-2C_1(\Lambda)\alpha - 8C_2(\Lambda)\alpha^2$, where C_1 and C_2 are explicit but diverging positive functions of Λ, and the one-particle piezoelectric polaron ground-state energy, which we denote by E (equal to inf spec H^1, using the notation of (2.5)) is bounded above by $-C_1(\Lambda)\alpha$, where C_1 is the same as in the lower bound. Then

$$\left(\psi_0,H_0^2\psi_0\right) \geq \text{inf spec } H_0^2\|\psi_0\|^2 \geq \left[-2C_1(\Lambda)\alpha - 8C_2(\Lambda)\alpha^2\right]\|\psi_0\|^2 \geq \left[2E - 8C_2(\Lambda)\alpha^2\right]\|\psi_0\|^2. \tag{2.7}$$

By grouping terms, we summarize what has been done so far – from Equation (2.4),

$$(\psi,H_A\psi) \geq \left[2E - 8C_2(\Lambda)\alpha^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{a_1^2} + \frac{A}{a_0+a_1}\right]\|\psi_0\|^2$$
$$+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\psi_n,H_0^2\psi_n\right) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left[\frac{A}{s_{n+1}} - \frac{\pi^2}{\min(a_{n+1},a_n)^2}\right]\|\psi_n\|^2. \tag{2.8}$$

This concludes the first part of the bounding of the terms in (2.4). What remains is the bounding of the energy expectations where the electrons are far apart, the terms $(\psi_n,H_0\psi_n)$ for $n \geq 1$. An additional localization will be performed to control these expectations in the next section.

3 Further Localization: Single-Electron Pinning

Let $n \geq 1$. We will spend this section bounding from below the term $(\psi_n,H_0^2\psi_n)$. We will perform a second localization where one of the electrons will be effectively pinned down, which will allow us at the end to arrive at a lower bound. This localization will be made to only one of the electrons, but either of them may be selected – we will pick the "second one" (the one with y-coordinates). Pinning just one of the electrons may seem odd at first, as the symmetry of the problem is apparently being broken, at least if one insists on treating the electrons as fermions. The point is that we are not a priori assuming any symmetry for the electrons; however, our final result still applies if one wants to treat them as such, even when some of the intermediate steps leading to it do not. In [8, Section 2] the two electrons were pinned in a symmetrical fashion, which introduced a small extra localization error with respect to what we do here.

For the space $\mathbb{R}^3$ we construct the following partition: Let f be a function $\mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ with the following properties: f is continuous, f has compact support, f is C^1 on its support, and $\|f\|_2 = 1$. Then consider the family of functions $f_u(x,y) \equiv f(y-u)$. Then obviously $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f_u^2\,du = 1$, and so the family forms a continuous partition of unity. We then have the following formula,

$$H_0^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f_u H_0^2 f_u\,du - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\nabla f_u|^2\,du. \tag{3.1}$$

(This follows from a proof analogous to the one found in [5, Section 3.1].) One would like now to make the localization error, the second term on the right side of the equation above, as small as possible. This is equal to $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\nabla f(y)|^2\,dy$, the infimum of which is just the infimum of the spectrum of $-\Delta$ with Dirichlet conditions on the boundary of the support. The symmetry of the problem involved will make it at the end

very natural to select a sphere of a certain radius, say R_n, as the support. We then choose f to be equal to the ground-state of the aforementioned operator on the sphere of radius R_n,

$$f(y) \equiv \begin{cases} \dfrac{\sin\left(\pi|y|/R_n\right)}{\sqrt{2\pi R_n}|y|} & |y| \leq R_n \\ 0 & |y| > R_n. \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

Since $-\Delta f = \left(\pi^2/R_n^2\right) f$, we conclude that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla f_u|^2 \, du$ can be made equal to π^2/R_n^2. We furthermore pick $2R_n < s_{n-1}$. From Equation (3.1), if $\psi_{n,u}$ denotes the function $\psi\phi_n f_u$, we then obtain the formula

$$(\psi_n, H_0^2\psi_n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\psi_{n,u}, H_0^2\psi_{n,u}) \, du - \frac{\pi^2}{R_n^2}\|\psi_n\|^2. \tag{3.3}$$

With this second localization we have accomplished the following: the "second" electron has been pinned down to a ball in 3-space, and the "first" electron lies away from the second one in a shell that encloses the ball just mentioned, staying always at a certain distance from it, without intersecting it. The set where the electrons are now may be described as $\Upsilon_{n,u} \equiv \left\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^6 : s_{n-1} \leq |x-y| \leq s_{n+1}, |y-u| \leq R_n\right\}$, and what has been obtained with this is that the electrons have been effectively separated, as the following inclusion shows,

$$\Upsilon_{n,u} \subset \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : s_{n-1} - R_n \leq |x-u| \leq s_{n+1} + R_n\right\} \times \left\{y \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |y-u| \leq R_n\right\}. \tag{3.4}$$

Note that, since $2R_n < s_{n-1}$, these two last subsets do not intersect, and so the cartesian product above can be embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$ as the union of the two. If we now let $V_{n,u}$ be the separating potential corresponding to $\Upsilon_{n,u}$, namely $V_{n,u}(x,y) = 0$ if $(x,y) \in \Upsilon_{n,u}$ and $V_{n,u} = \infty$ otherwise, by noting that $V_{n,u}$ commutes with the potentials of H_0, we get the following Feynman-Kac formula,

$$\begin{aligned} (\psi_{n,u}, H_0\psi_{n,u}) &= (\psi_{n,u}, (H_0 + V_{n,u})\,\psi_{n,u}) \\ &\geq \text{inf spec } (H_0 + V_{n,u})\|\psi_{n,u}\|^2 \\ &= -\lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \log E^{(x,y)} \left[\exp\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \mathcal{A}_{i,j}^T\right) \exp\left(-\int_0^T V_{n,u}(X_t^1, X_t^2)\, dt\right)\right] \|\psi_{n,u}\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where (x,y) is any point in the interior of $\Upsilon_{n,u}$, and $\mathcal{A}_{i,j}^T$ is defined as

$$\alpha \int_0^T \int_0^t \int_{|k|\leq\Lambda} \frac{e^{-|k|(t-s)}}{|k|} e^{-ik(X_t^i - X_s^j)} \, dk \, ds \, dt. \tag{3.6}$$

(See Subsection (1.3) of the introduction.) Note how $\exp\left(-\int_0^T V_{n,u}(X_t)\, dt\right)$ may be conveniently expressed as $\Omega_{n,u}^T$, the function equal to 1 if the 6-dimensional Brownian path X_t is completely contained in $\Upsilon_{n,u}$ for all times $0 \leq t \leq T$, and is zero otherwise. Note also how (3.6) can be computed explicitly, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} 4\pi\alpha \int_0^T \int_0^t & \frac{1}{|X_t^i - X_s^j|^2 + (t-s)^2} \\ & \times \left\{1 - e^{-\Lambda(t-s)} \left[\frac{t-s}{|X_t^i - X_s^j|} \sin\left(\Lambda|X_t^i - X_s^j|\right) + \cos\left(\Lambda|X_t^i - X_s^j|\right)\right]\right\} ds\, dt. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

It is easy to verify as well that the expression in braces is bounded below and above by 0 and 2, respectively. If now X is a Brownian path such that $\Omega_{n,u}^T(X) = 1$,

$$|X_t^1 - X_s^2| \geq |X_t^1 - X_t^2| - |X_s^2 - X_t^2| \geq s_{n-1} - 2R_n, \tag{3.8}$$

$$|X_t^2 - X_s^1| = |X_s^1 - X_t^2| \geq |X_s^1 - X_s^2| - |X_t^2 - X_s^2| \geq s_{n-1} - 2R_n, \tag{3.9}$$

and we then have that

$$E^{(x,y)}\left[\exp\left(\sum_{i,j=2}^{2}\mathcal{A}_{i,j}^{T}\right)\Omega_{n,u}^{T}(X)\right]$$
$$\leq E^{(x,y)}\left[\exp\left(\mathcal{A}_{1,1}^{T}+\mathcal{A}_{2,2}^{T}\right)\exp\left(\int_0^T\int_0^t\frac{16\pi\alpha}{(s_{n-1}-2R_n)^2+(t-s)^2}\,ds\,dt\right)\right], \tag{3.10}$$

and since

$$16\pi\alpha\int_0^T\int_0^t\frac{ds\,dt}{(s_{n-1}-2R_n)^2+(t-s)^2}\leq 16\pi\alpha T\int_0^\infty\frac{dx}{(s_{n-1}-2R_n)^2+x^2}=\frac{8\pi^2\alpha T}{s_{n-1}-2R_n}, \tag{3.11}$$

it follows that, by using the independence of $\mathcal{A}_{1,1}^T$ and $\mathcal{A}_{2,2}^T$, (3.10) is bounded above by

$$\exp\left(\frac{8\pi^2\alpha T}{s_{n-1}-2R_n}\right)E^x\left[\exp\left(\mathcal{A}_{1,1}^T\right)\right]E^y\left[\exp\left(\mathcal{A}_{2,2}^T\right)\right]. \tag{3.12}$$

From this and the estimate (3.5), we obtain that

$$(\psi_{n,u},H_0\psi_{n,u})\geq\left\{-\lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}E^x\left[\exp\left(\mathcal{A}_{1,1}^T\right)\right]-\lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}E^y\left[\exp\left(\mathcal{A}_{2,2}^T\right)\right]-\frac{8\pi^2\alpha}{s_{n-1}-2R_n}\right\}\|\psi_{n,u}\|^2$$
$$=\left(2E-\frac{8\pi^2\alpha}{s_{n-1}-2R_n}\right)\|\psi_{n,u}\|^2, \tag{3.13}$$

where, as defined in the previous section, E denotes the ground-state energy of the 1-electron piezoelectric polaron, inf spec H^1. We then conclude, from Equation (3.3),

$$(\psi_n,H_0\psi_n)\geq\left(2E-\frac{8\pi^2\alpha}{s_{n-1}-2R_n}-\frac{\pi^2}{R_n^2}\right)\|\psi_n\|^2. \tag{3.14}$$

By collecting terms, we conclude from this and the previous section that

$$(\psi,H_A^2\psi)\geq\left[2E-8C_2(\Lambda)\alpha^2-\frac{\pi^2}{a_1^2}+\frac{A}{a_0+a_1}\right]\|\psi_0\|^2$$
$$+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left[2E+\frac{A}{s_{n+1}}-\frac{\pi^2}{\min(a_{n+1},a_n)^2}-\frac{8\pi^2\alpha}{s_{n-1}-2R_n}-\frac{\pi^2}{R_n^2}\right]\|\psi_n\|^2, \tag{3.15}$$

and so no-binding will occur if each one of the terms in brackets is greater than or equal to $2E$, or

$$A\geq\left[8C_2(\Lambda)(b_0+b_1)+\frac{\pi^2(b_0+b_1)}{b_1^2}\right]\vee\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty}\left[\frac{\pi^2t_{n+1}}{\min(b_{n+1},b_n)^2}+\frac{8\pi^2t_{n+1}}{t_{n-1}-2L_n}+\frac{\pi^2t_{n+1}}{L_n^2}\right]\alpha, \tag{3.16}$$

where we made the substitutions $b_i=a_i\alpha$, $t_i=s_i\alpha$ and $L_n=R_n\alpha$ in order to factor out α, and $\vee$ denotes maximum. The expression to the right in (3.16) is certainly not ∞ if the parameters are chosen accordingly. For instance, by picking $L_n=t_{n-1}/4$ and $b_i=bl^i$, for some $l>1$, the right side of (3.16) is less than or equal to

$$\left[8C_2(\Lambda)b(1+l)+\frac{\pi^2(1+l)}{bl^2}\right]\vee\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty}\left[\frac{\pi^2l^{n+2}}{b(l-1)l^{2n}}+\frac{16\pi^2l^{n+2}}{l^n-1}+\frac{16\pi^2(l-1)l^{n+2}}{b(l^n-1)^2}\right]\alpha$$
$$\leq\left[8C_2(\Lambda)b(1+l)+\frac{\pi^2(1+l)}{bl^2}\right]\vee\left[\frac{\pi^2l}{b(l-1)}+\frac{16\pi^2l^3}{l-1}+\frac{16\pi^2l^3}{b(l-1)}\right]\alpha. \tag{3.17}$$

For a fixed value of Λ one can in fact minimize the entire expression above, Equation (3.16), despite it being an infinite dimensional problem. This will be illustrated in the next section for the polaron model. In any case, the upshot is that there is an explicit function of Λ, C, such that if $A\geq C(\Lambda)\alpha$, then no binding occurs.

4 No-Binding in the Optical Polaron and Nelson Models

The same calculation as above can be carried out for the optical polaron model, and one can minimize completely the final result, the analogue of Equation (3.16), since there is no dependence on Λ. Computations here are entirely similar to those from the previous section, and very few changes have to be made. In the following, H^2_A will be the two-electron optical polaron model with Coulomb strength A (as before for the piezoelectric polaron), H^1 will be the 1-electron analog, and E will be the ground-state energy of H^1. By using the inequalities $\inf \operatorname{spec} H^2_0 \geq -2\alpha - 2\alpha^2$ [4, 2] and $E \leq -\alpha$ [7, 16, 17, 12] (which follows from the argument leading to (A.6), but applied to the optical polaron), Equation (2.7) changes to

$$(\psi_0, H^2_0\psi_0) \geq (-2\alpha - 2\alpha^2)\|\psi_0\|^2 \geq (2E - 2\alpha^2)\|\psi_0\|^2, \tag{4.1}$$

whereas now (3.13) becomes

$$(\psi_{n,u}, H_0\psi_{n,u}) \geq \left(2E - \frac{\sqrt{2}\alpha T}{s_{n-1} - 2R_n}\right)\|\psi_{n,u}\|^2, \tag{4.2}$$

which follows immediately from the argument in the previous section leading to (3.13), but applied now to the bipolaron action

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \int_0^T \int_0^t \frac{e^{-(t-s)}}{|X^i_t - X^j_s|}\, ds\, dt. \tag{4.3}$$

From this, the no-binding condition (the analog of Equation (3.16)) becomes

$$A \geq \left[2(b_0 + b_1) + \frac{\pi^2(b_0 + b_1)}{b_1^2}\right] \vee \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{\pi^2 t_{n+1}}{\min(b_{n+1}, b_n)^2} + \frac{\sqrt{2}t_{n+1}}{t_{n-1} - 2L_n} + \frac{\pi^2 t_{n+1}}{L_n^2}\right] \alpha. \tag{4.4}$$

Since the expression involves only numbers, it is amenable to minimization. Even though one can eliminate the variable L_n by solving a cubic equation (which corresponds to optimizing the two last summands in the second bracket in (4.4)), the computations involved in the elimination are so cumbersome that we will just content ourselves with simplifying the minimization problem by rescaling $L_n = t_{n-1}x_n/2$, which significantly smooths out the numerical work involved. We are led to minimizing $F : (0,\infty)^\infty \times (0,1)^\infty \to (0,\infty)$, defined as

$$\begin{aligned} &F((b_0, b_1, b_2, \ldots), (x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots)) \\ &= \left[2(b_0 + b_1) + \frac{\pi^2(b_0 + b_1)}{b_1^2}\right] \vee \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{\pi^2 t_{n+1}}{\min(b_{n+1}, b_n)^2} + \frac{\sqrt{2}t_{n+1}}{t_{n-1}}\left(\frac{1}{1 - x_n} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2}{t_{n-1}x_n^2}\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

The minimization of F, in principle an infinite-dimensional problem, is much simpler than it seems, since it can be reduced to a low-dimensional one. Indeed, consider the truncated function $F_0 \vee F_1 : (0,\infty)^2 \times (0,1) \to (0,\infty)$ given by the maximum of the first two terms, that is

$$F_0 \vee F_1((b_0, b_1), x) = \left[2(b_0 + b_1) + \frac{\pi^2(b_0 + b_1)}{b_1^2}\right] \vee \left[\frac{\pi^2 t_2}{\min(b_2, b_1)^2} + \frac{\sqrt{2}t_2}{t_0}\left(\frac{1}{1 - x} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2}{t_0 x^2}\right)\right]. \tag{4.6}$$

$F_0 \vee F_1$ is now so simple that it can be minimized directly through numerical optimization. We get that its minimum is smaller than 34.6 when the parameters $b_0 = 9.43, b_1 = b_2 = 4.80, x = 0.740$ are chosen. If we now pick $b_n = (n-1)b_2 = (n-1) \times 4.8$ for $n \geq 3$ and $x_n = x = 0.74$ for all $n \geq 1$, it is easy to show that $F_n \geq F_{n+1}$ for all $n \geq 1$, where F_n for $n \geq 2$ is defined in the obvious way – as the n-th term in brackets to the right of the big wedge symbol above, in Equation (4.5). In this way we have found that the minimum of the expression (4.5) is less than 34.6. In order to compare this with previous results in [8, 1], we ought to multiply by $\sqrt{2}$, as in those works the Laplacian was not divided by 2, and we get a number smaller than 49.0. This is indeed a negligible improvement over the previous results of 52.1 [1] and 53.2 [8].

We would like to remark here that the partitions considered have been indeed fully optimized: One may think for instance of taking not bumps in the first partition, but pills (meaning functions that are part sine, part straight line, part cosine) – it is easy to see that one gets the optimal answer when all the straight-line segments are collapsed into a point, except for the first one. This is why we considered just one pill and let the other functions be bumps, and not pills.

We close the main body of the present article by briefly commenting on what happens in the massless Nelson model case. A family of lower bounds was provided for that model in [2], but here we will pick just one of them. (One could certainly refine the following argument, but here we are mostly interested in illustrating a point, and not so much in sharpness.) For $N = 2$, by picking $\theta = 3/2$, we get, from (4.29) in [2],

$$E_\alpha^{\Lambda,2} + Q_\alpha^{\Lambda,2} \geq -D_1\alpha^2 - D_2\alpha^8, \tag{4.7}$$

where D_1 and D_2 are positive constants independent of Λ, $E_\alpha^{\Lambda,2}$ is the ground-state energy of the 2-particle massless Nelson model with cutoff Λ, and $Q_\alpha^{\Lambda,2}$ is a renormalizing term, defined earlier, in expression (1.2), with $N = 2$. (The term α^8 is most likely spurious – see [2].) In any case, since we know that $E_\alpha^{\Lambda,1} + Q_\alpha^{\Lambda,1} \leq 0$, where $E_\alpha^{\Lambda,1}$ and $Q_\alpha^{\Lambda,1}$ are the 1-particle analogs of $E_\alpha^{\Lambda,2}$ and $Q_\alpha^{\Lambda,2}$ (see the first appendix), all the steps to conclude no-binding are identical to those for the piezoelectric polaron, except that now the condition reads as

$$A \geq \left[D_1(b_0+b_1) + D_2(b_0+b_1)\alpha^6 + \frac{\pi^2(b_0+b_1)}{b_1^2}\right] \vee \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{\pi^2 t_{n+1}}{\min(b_{n+1},b_n)^2} + \frac{8\pi^2 t_{n+1}}{t_{n-1}-2L_n} + \frac{\pi^2 t_{n+1}}{L_n^2}\right]\alpha, \tag{4.8}$$

and so, as can be seen, even though a no-binding condition is obtained, it is not linear in α. As was said in [2], there are probably no extra terms besides the α^2 one, and so D_2 is really zero. If that is the case, then indeed one would get a condition identical to that for the piezoelectric polaron (even better, since it would not diverge with Λ). One may as well say that, after all, α ought to be in a certain range $[0, \beta]$, and by bounding $\alpha \leq \beta$, one could eliminate the higher order term in α, and this would lead to a linear relationship $A \geq C\alpha$, as expected. As said earlier, this is just an illustration, and many other no-binding conditions may be obtained from the general bound [2, Equation 4.29]. As a final comment, when we say that no binding holds for both the renormalized and unrenormalized theories we mean this: even though in principle we have proven no-binding only for the unrenormalized Nelson Hamiltonian, the corresponding result for the renormalized theory follows immediately, as $E_\alpha^{\Lambda,2} = 2E_\alpha^{\Lambda,1}$ implies

$$E_\alpha^{\Lambda,2} + Q_\alpha^{\Lambda,2} = 2\left(E_\alpha^{\Lambda,1} + Q_\alpha^{\Lambda,1}\right), \tag{4.9}$$

and the no-binding result in this case is obtained by taking $\Lambda \to \infty$. (See the discussion preceding [11, Equation (1.2)] for technical remarks concerning this last limiting step.)

Appendix A: Proof of upper and lower bounds for the piezoelectric polaron

In the present appendix we will prove the upper and lower bounds stated above in Section 2 for the ground-state energy of the 2-electron piezoelectric polaron. We will actually do it for any number of particles N. It relies heavily on a recent paper of the author on the Nelson model [2]. We start from [2, Equation 4.13] with $\mu = 0$ (the piezoelectric polaron case), the stochastic integral of which describes, in very vague terms, an equivalent "stochastic action" for the action of the Nelson model, which we shall call $\mathcal{C}_{m,n}$, as in [2],

$$4\pi \int_u^T \int_0^t \frac{X_{s\wedge u}^n - X_u^m}{|X_{s\wedge u}^n - X_u^m|}\left[1 + \Theta(s-u)\right] \int_0^\Lambda e^{-r(t-s)} e^{-r^2(t-u)/2} e^{-r^2(s-u)_+/2} \varphi(r|X_{s\wedge u}^n - X_u^m|) r^2 \, dr \, ds \, dt, \tag{A.1}$$

where Θ is Heaviside's theta function – the indicator function of $[0,\infty)$, the vectors X^n are 3D Brownian motions, $\varphi(x)$ is the function $(\sin x - x\cos x)/x^2$, and $1 \leq m, n \leq N$. By splitting the s-integral into the

$[0,u]$ and $[u,t]$ fragments, we can bound $\mathcal{C}_{m,n}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{C}_{m,n}| \leq & 4\pi \int_0^\Lambda \int_0^u \frac{1-e^{-(r+r^2/2)(T-u)}}{1+r/2} r e^{-r(u-s)} |\varphi(r|X_u^m - X_s^n|)|\, ds\, dr \\ & + 8\pi \int_0^\Lambda \int_u^T \int_u^t e^{-r(t-s)} e^{-r^2(t-u)/2} e^{-r^2(s-u)/2} |\varphi(r|X_u^m - X_u^n|)| r^2\, ds\, dt\, dr \\ \equiv & \mathcal{D}_{m,n} + \mathcal{E}_{m,n}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

It is shown in [2, Lemma 4.2] that $\mathcal{E}_{m,n}$ is bounded above by $4\pi\|\varphi(x)/x\|_1$. A crude estimate on $\mathcal{D}$ allows us to bound it from above as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\Lambda \int_0^u \frac{r e^{-r(u-s)}}{1+r/2} |\varphi(r|X_u^m - X_s^n|)|\, ds\, dr \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty \int_0^\Lambda \int_0^u \frac{r e^{-r(u-s)}}{1+r/2}\, ds\, dr \\ \leq & \|\varphi\|_\infty \int_0^\Lambda \frac{dr}{1+r/2} = 2\|\varphi\|_\infty \log(1+\Lambda/2). \end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

$\mathcal{C}_{m,n}$ is then bounded above by a logarithmically diverging function of Λ. It follows then from the functional integral for the piezoelectric polaron, Equation (4.1) in [2] with $\omega = |k|$, and the Clark-Ocone formula (see Formula (1.7), the discussion above Equation (4.6), and Equations (4.22), (4.23), all in [2]),

$$\begin{aligned} & E\left[\exp\left(\alpha \sum_{m,n} \iiint_0^T \int_0^t \chi_\Lambda(k) e^{-|k|(t-s)} e^{-ik(X_t^m - X_s^n)} |k|^{-1}\, ds\, dt\, dk\right)\right] \\ \leq & \exp\left[\alpha N T \int \frac{\chi_\Lambda(k)\, dk}{|k|^2\,(|k|/2+1)} + o(T)\right] \exp\left\{2\alpha^2 N^3 p \left[\|\varphi\|_\infty \log(1+\Lambda/2) + 2\pi\|\varphi(x)/x\|_1\right]^2 T\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{A.4}$$

for any $p > 1$ (whose value we may take equal to one by using a limiting procedure). We obtain in this way that the ground state energy of the piezo-electric polaron is bounded below by (see Equation (4.1) in [2]),

$$-8\pi\alpha N \log(1+\Lambda/2) - 2\alpha^2 N^3 \left[\|\varphi\|_\infty \log(1+\Lambda/2) + 2\pi\|\varphi(x)/x\|_1\right]^2 \equiv -C_1(\Lambda)\alpha N - C_2(\Lambda)\alpha^2 N^3. \tag{A.5}$$

An upper bound, good enough for our purposes here, follows immediately from Jensen's Inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & E\left[\exp\left(\alpha \sum_{m,n} \iiint_0^T \int_0^t \chi_\Lambda(k) e^{-|k|(t-s)} e^{-ik(X_t^m - X_s^n)} |k|^{-1}\, ds\, dt\, dk\right)\right] \\ \geq & \exp\left[E\left(\alpha \sum_{m,n} \iiint_0^T \int_0^t \chi_\Lambda(k) e^{-|k|(t-s)} e^{-ik(X_t^m - X_s^n)} |k|^{-1}\, ds\, dt\, dk\right)\right] \\ = & \exp\left[\alpha N T \int \frac{\chi_\Lambda(k)}{|k|^2(|k|/2+1)}\, dk + o(T)\right] = \exp\left[8\pi\alpha N \log(1+\Lambda/2) + o(T)\right], \end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

from which the upper bound $-C_1(\Lambda)\alpha N$ for the piezoelectric polaron is obtained. For the second to last equality, see [2, Equation (4.35)]. Both inequalities agree for small α at the result one gets from second-order perturbation theory [26]. Our result has the advantage over a previous lower bound for the piezoelectric polaron in [24] that an explicit answer is obtained, valid for all values of α. In [24] the lower bound involves quantities that simplify only in limiting regimes of α.

We would like to finish this appendix by pointing out a curious fact: One of the lower bounds for the piezoelectric polaron in [24] contains a term proportional to $\alpha \log \alpha$ that is not divergent in Λ, which is obtained under certain assumptions on α. A term just like this was obtained in a lower bound in [2] in a certain regime of α, but squared. This seems more like a coincidence than an actual connection, and we believe our result in [2] should not be construed as some type of second order correction from what is in [24], or anything similar. As explained in [2], this logarithmically divergent term in α is probably not there really.

Appendix B: Note on the Retarded Nature of the Polaron and Nelson Actions

Here we want to address a mistake made in Section 5.1 of the Ph.D. thesis of the author. There we localized the six-dimensional vector (x, y), representing the positions of two electrons in 3-space, in the region $\Omega \equiv \{(x, y) : |x - y| \geq d\}$. The two electrons are then, apparently, "well-separated." But this is not true – at least not if the electrons interact with each other through their coupling to a polar crystal. This may seem perplexing at first, but it is not so if one understands that the electrons do not attract each other instantaneously; in fact they attract their entire past histories in space, with different weights, with the very remote past being less relevant than the more recent times. If we focus our attention on one of the electrons for a moment, we would see that it is always separated from the other one; however, if one stops that electron and draws the entire past history of the other particle as a curve, it may happen that that curve almost touches the stopped electron we are looking at. Then the electrons are no longer separated. The correct interpretation is to say that the entire past histories of the particles interact, and not just their instantaneous positions. Mathematically speaking, merely localizing (x, y) in Ω will mean that the Brownian path (X_t, Y_t) satisfies $|X_t - Y_t| \geq d$; but it will not necessarily mean that $|X_t - Y_s| \geq d$ for all t and s. The mistake made in the thesis was assuming that $|X_t - Y_s| \geq d$ held just by localizing in Ω. One further localization was missing, and is the one we added here, where we pinned one of the electrons, in which case the entire trajectories are now well-separated.

References

[1] R.D. Benguria, G.A. Bley, Improved results on the no-binding of bipolarons, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 45, 045205 (2012).

[2] G.A. Bley, A Lower Bound on the Renormalized Nelson Model, arXiv:1609.08590 (2016).

[3] G.A. Bley, Estimates on Functional Integrals of Non-Relativistic Quantum Field Theory, with Applications to the Nelson and Polaron Models, Ph.D. thesis, University of Virginia Library (2016).

[4] G.A. Bley, L.E. Thomas, Estimates on Functional Integrals of Quantum Mechanics and Non-Relativistic Quantum Field Theory, arXiv:1512.00356v2 (2015).

[5] H.L. Cycon, R.G. Froese, W. Kirsch, B. Simon, Schrödinger Operators, with Applications to Quantum Mechanics and Global Geometry, Springer (2008).

[6] R.P. Feynman, Mathematical Formulation of the Quantum Theory of Electromagnetic Interaction, Phys. Rev. 80, 440 (1950).

[7] R.P. Feynman, Slow Electrons in a Polar Crystal, Phys. Rev. 97, 660 (1955).

[8] R.L. Frank, E.H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, L.E. Thomas, Stability and Absence of Binding for Multi-Polaron Systems, Publ. Math. l'HÉS 113, 39 (2011).

[9] H. Fröhlich, Electrons in lattice fields, Adv. Phys. 3, 325 (1954).

[10] H. Fröhlich, Theory of Electrical Breakdown in Ionic Crystals, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A, 160, 230 (1937).

[11] M. Griesemer, J.S. Møller, Bounds on the Minimal Energy of Translation Invariant N-Polaron Systems, Comm. Math. Phys. 297, 283 (2010).

[12] M. Gurari, Self-energy of slow electrons in polar materials, Phil. Mag. Ser. 7, 44, 329 (1953).

[13] E. Haga, Note on the Slow Electrons in a Polary Crystal, Prog. Theor. Phys, 11, 449 (1954).

[14] A.R. Hutson, Piezoelectric Scattering and Phonon Drag in ZnO and CdS, J. Appl. Phys. 32, 2287 (1961).

[15] D.M. Larsen, Cyclotron Resonance of Piezoelectric Polarons, Phys. Rev. 142, 428 (1966).

[16] T.-D. Lee, F.E. Low, D. Pines, The Motion of Slow Electrons in a Polar Crystal, Phys. Rev. 90, 297 (1953).

[17] T.-D. Lee, D. Pines, The Motion of Slow Electrons in Polar Crystals, Phys. Rev. 88, 960 (1952).

[18] E.H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, The Stability of Matter in Quantum Mechanics, Cambridge University Press (2010).

[19] E.H. Lieb, K. Yamazaki, Ground-State Energy and Effective Mass of the Polaron, Phys. Rev. 111, 728 (1958).

[20] G.D. Mahan, J.J. Hopfield, Piezoelectric polaron effects in CdS, Phys. Rev. Lett. 12, 241 (1964).

[21] E. Nelson, Interaction of nonrelativistic particles with a quantized scalar field, J. Math. Phys. 5, 1190 (1964).

[22] E. Nelson, Schrödinger particles interacting with a quantized scalar field, in Analysis in Function Space: Proceedings of a conference on the theory and applications of analysis function space, MIT Press (1964).

[23] M. Rona, G. Whitfield, Energy-versus-Momentum Relation for the Piezoelectric Polaron, Phys. Rev. B 7, 2727 (1973).

[24] J. Thomchick, G. Whitfield, Lower bound for the piezoelectric polaron, Phys. Rev. B 9, 1506 (1974).

[25] S. Tomonaga, On the Effect of the Field Reactions on the Interaction of Mesotrons and Nuclear Particles. III., Prog. Theor. Phys. 2, 6 (1947).

[26] G. Whitfield, J. Gerstner, K. Tharmalingam, Motion of the Piezoelectric Polaron at Zero Temperature, Phys. Rev. 165, 993 (1968).

[27] G. Whitfield, P.M. Platzman, Simultaneous Strong and Weak Coupling in the Piezoelectric Polaron, Phys. Rev. B 6, 3987 (1972).